

REMARKS

Claims 22-27 and 33-34 have been canceled. Claims 1-21 remain in the Application, and of these, Claim 1 has been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention, and Claims 1-21 have been amended to address an informality pointed out by the Examiner.

In the Office Action mailed on February 22, 2007, the Examiner objected to Claims 1-27 and 33-34 as lacking periods at the end of the claims. The Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12-13, 15, 17, 22-23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,872,879 issued to Le Chatelier et al. ("Le Chatelier '879"); rejected Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 14, 16, 18-21 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Le Chatelier '879; and rejected Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Le Chatelier '879 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,584,949 issued to Ingram ("Ingram '949").

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the personal interview on March 13, 2007, at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office with Attorney David P. Dureska, during which Attorney Dureska presented a computer-animated video-style demonstration, on a CD, of the method recited in Claim 1 of the Application as compared to the method disclosed in Le Chatelier '879. Applicants now respectfully submit this Response, in which the claims have been amended pursuant to the Office Action and in light of the interview.

Based upon the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims remaining in the application, that is, Claims 1-21, are in condition for allowance.

I. THE OBJECTIONS TO CLAIMS 1-27 AND 33-34.

The Examiner objected to Claims 1-27 and 33-34 as lacking periods at the end of the claims. Applicants believe that the periods may not have appeared after scanning and/or

electronic transmission of the prior communication to the Office, and have amended Claims 1-21, which remain in the Application, to ensure that the periods are visible.

II. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 22-27 AND 33-34.

Turning first to the claims that have been canceled, the Examiner rejected Claims 22-23 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Le Chatelier '879; rejected Claims 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Le Chatelier '879; and rejected Claims 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Le Chatelier '879 in view of Ingram '949. Claim 22 was an independent apparatus claim directed to a tire inflation system, and Claims 23-27 and 33-34 depended from Claim 22. As discussed in the March 13, 2007 interview with the Examiner, since the crux of the invention is the method, and to streamline prosecution of this Application, Applicants have canceled these apparatus claims.

III. THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21.

Of the claims remaining in the Application, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 12-13, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Le Chatelier '879, and rejected Claims 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 14, 16, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Le Chatelier '879. Claims 2-21 depend from independent Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 1 pursuant to the March 13, 2007 interview with the Examiner, adding the recitation "whereby over-inflation of the tire generally is prevented by said method steps." Basis for this amendment appears in the specification on at least page 23, lines 16-21, and page 27, lines 17-21. As shown and discussed during the interview, Applicants respectfully submit that Le Chatelier '879 lacks at least the determination of an inflation pressure

of the tire with a step-up procedure and inflation of the tire with an extended-pulse procedure to generally prevent over-inflation of the tire, as recited in Applicants' amended Claim 1.

Since amended independent Claim 1 recites features of the invention that are not taught or disclosed by Le Chatelier '879, Applicants respectfully submit that Le Chatelier '879 does not anticipate, or render obvious, amended independent Claim 1.

In addition, because Claims 2-21 depend from amended independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that they, too, are not anticipated or rendered obvious by Le Chatelier '879.

IV. CONCLUSION.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims remaining in the application now are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is respectfully requested, and allowance of Claims 1-21 at an early date is hereby respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCKINGHAM, DOOLITTLE & BURROUGHS, LLP



By: _____
David P. Dureska, Registration No. 34,152
Edward T. Kennedy, Registration No. 48,478

4518 Fulton Drive, N.W.
P.O. Box 35548
Canton, OH 44735-5548
Telephone: (330) 491-5289
Facsimile: (330) 252-5454
E-Mail: ddureska@bdblaw.com
Attorney Docket No.: HEND-BC-REG-CIP (45007-281)